UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,489	03/01/2004	Serge Carillo	ST94037A/80375.0033 9027	
29693 WILEY REIN I	7590 07/21/201 LLP	EXAMINER		
1776 K. STREE		LONG, SCOTT		
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1633	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/788,489	CARILLO ET AL.				
Examiner-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	SCOTT LONG	1633				
All Participants:	Status of Application: <u>RE</u>	<u>JECTED</u>				
(1) <u>SCOTT LONG</u> .	(3)					
(2) <u>DAVID KULIK</u> .	(4)					
Date of Interview: <u>16 July 2010</u>	Time: <u>4:15pm</u>					
Type of Interview:						
Part I.						
Rejection(s) discussed:  New Grounds - Huibregtse						
Claims discussed: 1, 2						
Prior art documents discussed: Huibregtse et al. (Molecular and Cellular Biology. Aug. 1993; 13(8): 4918-4927) and Huibregtse et al. (EMBO Journal. 1991; 10(13): 4129-4135)						
Part II.						
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  See Continuation Sheet						
Part III.						
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.</li> </ul>						
/SCOTT LONG/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1633 (A)	pplicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)				

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner informed the applicant's representative that Prior Art was discovered which anticipated instant claims 1, 4, and 8. The examiner also proposed an examiner's amendment incorporating the limitations of claim 2 into claim 1, which would make claims 1, 3-8 allowable. The applicant's representative refused this offer. The applicant's representative began to discuss claim limitations which were not previously included in the instant claims. The examiner explained that applicant's representative's proposed claim language would require further consideration, particularly a written description analysis. The applicant's representative again refused an Examiner's Amendment based upon the pending claim language. The examiner informed the applicant's representative that as a result of the refusal Examiner's Amendment offered by the examiner, the cited art required the examiner to reopen prosecution.